	Q146 If you have additional comments about your experiences as a supervisor/manager upholding scientific integrity, or suggestions for how you as a supervisor/manager could be better supported in your efforts, please share them below.
1	An issue I have with scientific integrity is the endless time involved in reviews of some of our work, especially when it falls under the Advanced Notice clearance classification. This process originally had a fixed time window. Work work be reviewed within a defined period of time after which PI's could submit articles to a journal. Now it is an undefined period of time and, in practice takes way too much time. It is an important step, but the open ended timing is a material issue. Given that scientific integrity calls for timely release of information it is not only a general management issue, it's also an integrity issue.
2	I wish there were consequences to the lack of integrity. (b) (5) Should not have a job at this agency.
3	Certain senior managers do not seem to understand that scientific integrity is not the same as always being overly conservative in approach, so in this administration there is a strong push towards being overly protective when that is not called for. (b) (5) (b) (5) While certain senior managers are giving lip service to following the science and scientific integrity, the reality is they're following the politics, which is a problem. From my experience this will lead to even more problems down the road when decisions cannot be justified based on the science, and we will either have to backtrack on decisions, or rely on non-sensical communications to hide the lack of scientific justification for the decisions.
4	I think they need to be willing to support filing a SI violation. (b) (5)
5	Given the events of the last two years I feel strongly that we have been well supported.
6	(b) (6) I think there are times when science is balanced by policies and management in the cleanup of hazardous waste sites. I'd like to learn more.
7	Would be useful to have training tailored for the mission support organizations, such as OCFO, OMS, OGC, and others which may not carry out science functions, but support those who do.
8	(b) (5) The science should lead to a conclusion, not the other way around.
9	1) Supervisors struggle to deal with issues regarding scientific credit on projects because often the conflict lies outside our branch 2) We need more open discussion regarding how building research projects must be done with integrity and not as a tool for excluding ideas or people
10	With a master's degree in political science, and many years of practical experience supervising and managing engineers and basic scientists, it was great to see this survey include my area of expertise under the definition of science. Now it would be great if my ability to be promoted reflected that because as of now, (b) (6) and not eligible to be promoted into a position that manages engineers and basic scientists. This is a fairly recent development. In previous years, I was able to apply for such positions and make the cert list.
11	Our previous political leadership did not care about or care to know about scientific integrity. (b) (7)(A) . We now have leadership who seem to understand this critical issue.
12	The most key concept as I see it remains understanding what is a legitimate policy decision that considers science as well as other factors. Its clear from news reports that if scientists/science was shut out or ignored in direct conflict with the program/regulatory requirements, that is wrong. The tougher issue is legitimate policy decisions - how to define; acknowledge, accept.
13	I have felt that my staff and immediate supervisors have always fulfilled and supported the scientific integrity principles.
14	It would help to offer regular anonymized "case studies" of actual instances of scientific integrity breaches (or potential bruises) at the EPA, and how they were handled. Like a monthly Scientific Integrity "Spotlight" or "Did you know" series. Having concrete examples always illustrates these concepts much better than broad generic language.
15	I feel pretty confident that Scientific Integrity is well supported in my office and appreciate that from the leaders in my organization.
16	My experience was that in my daily role and interactions with my teammates who I supervise, we were aware and tried to adhere to SI expectations at all times. However under the previous administration, (b) (5) .
17	too often, SI topics focus on the big issues, like political interference, and too seldom discuss more frequent issues like authorship.
18	I think small group training with discussion of examples would be very helpful. It seems that sometimes that confusion could arise between what is expected of an employee as part of their job and what is required to fulfill government requirements. Sometimes the bureaucracy (clearance, etc) means it takes longer to get the science done but is an important part of what we do.
19	Senior management makes decisions that are are not based on science and does not show interest in understanding the science or incorporating it into the policy decision making process. Do not exclude technical experts from planning and decision making. At least include people who understand the science when discussing policy decisions. Once decisions are made that are not supported by the science include technical staff in discussion on rollout.
20	N/A
21	provide training to new hires on scientific integrity: Data quality objectives, program specific regulatory requirements, and technical case studies.
22	The prior Administration did not adhere to what I understand to be scientific integrity. I believe the current one is doing so. Additional brush-up training should be provided to all of us to enable us to refresh our recollection of the importance of and content in the policy and its application.
23	(b) (6) scientific integrity is integral to our success on a daily basis. All data generated by the lab has to have the quality and robust validation for all our clients use and trust. All effort for consistent deliverables, the quality controls established and monitored mean nothing without scientific integrity. It drives everything we produce as a lab.
24	A couple of years ago, I invited folks from Scientific Integrity to speak at my office's All Hands meeting. I think that was a great way to get all of our staff more familiar with SI. I have now changed jobs into a new office, and I would like folks to come speak to my new office. I will contact the office to discuss that.
25	I'm a newer manager, so limited experience in this area in that role - so far.
26	We need stronger safeguards against the political whims of appointed officials, to protect us from the assault on science that we experienced during the Trump Administration. (b) (7)(A) We lost precious years in the fight against climate change.
27	annual or periodic email reports to agency employees
28	I have been supported by QA, upper management and the POCs of our high visibility research-all of them make sure that our data and information was accurate and the communications clearly stated what the data was to be used and what it was not to be used for.
29	The notion of scientific integrity was directly incompatible with the last administration and its two compromised and corrupt administrators. We all know it.
30	addressing this policy in every day activities, more education for staff on statutes, regulations, policy, guidance vs scientific information.
31	In some cases, senior management seemed less inclined to support scientific integrity. In general, 1st and 2nd line managers seem to have great support for scientific integrity. More dedication to scientific integrity at the highest levels of the agency would be very helpful.
32	(b) (7)(A)
33	There must be more guard rails to prevent political interference in the process of gathering scientific data and making conclusions over such data. Scientific integrity cannot be something that is a focus of one administration but not another. The Inspector General failed to timely enforce the scientific integrity policy in the last administration. Where it was investigated, their reports are only being issued now. The IG, and other entities that exist to protect scientific integrity independently from political appointees are critical.
34	Our program supports and advocates for scientific integrity in the work performed by staff. The tools and training provided by Scientific Integrity officials is welcomed and useful, and appreciate efforts to support and uphold the integrity goals and standards.
35	I believe we need annual training on scientific integrity at all levels. As we bring new staff in and new managers - we need to refresh at least annually.
36	I'm having trouble responding to this survey (was there a small user group to test drive it?). FIRST: The 2019-2020 timeframe that many questions refer to is more than just a little curious, it makes it hard to share important experiences. SECOND: There are errors, e.g., in some of the questions with the 2019-2020 timeframe limit, (b) (6) THIRD: I don't know to respond to questions that don't have a stated timeframe limit because my experiences are very different over the past several years, e.g.: (1) early experience - few SI issues at EPA or in my office (2) 2017-2018 - major SI problems at EPA and in my office (3) 2019-2020 - major SI problems at EPA and some improvement in my office (4) 2021 (to date): significant improvement at EPA and in my office

37 It would be helpful if Senior Executive Service managers had a refresher on the importance of establishing Data Quality Objectives prior to collecting data.
38 My job is mostly involved with regulatory application and interpretation. Very little, maybe evaluation of controls, involves scientific integrity.
39 Training & process
40 I raised issues to the right offices re: various issues last four years, i feel like i hit a brick wall on all fronts, FACMD, OGC, and Science Integrity Office, and the (b) (6) .
41 It would be useful to have more/better guidance for career supervisors and managers about how to address disagreements and disputes about scientific findings that involve political leadership. How should they be documented, who should be notified, etc.
42 Translating Knolwedge (internal) to Content (publicly available) requires a great deal of energy. It is critical for "insiders" EPA/contractors/state, etc., to appreciate the power of uncertainty for our citizens. (b) (6) means that we are in contact with citizens that are in uncertain situations. Piling a bunch of tables and charts on them is not the same as communicating in such a way that the citizens can interact credibly with the project AND have a true opportunity to change the outcome (within the bounds of legal constraints).
43 n/a
44 Do not have political senior management review scientific reports until after they are released. Review by SES level shoudl be sufficient. In the past two years, political management seemed to question basic scientific principles which were the basis of some scientific reports.
45 (b) (6) I traditionally rely heavily on the independence and scientific integrity of the expert witness testimony of EPA's scientists and the science EPA conducts. During the past few years, I and all my staff became quite concerned that the evidence presented to us by the Agency would not necessarily be of the same integrity and quality, and would not be driven by an effort to determine what was in the best interest of the country and the people as a whole. I have to say that these serious concerns have not abated in full we continue to wonder if the the scientific staff and research of the Agency has been detrimentally effected long-term.
46 We need more support for first line supervisors who have to deal with unfounded allegations about scientific integrity violations.
47 I just want to reiterate my desire to create a way for EPA career employees to document their recommendations to leadership. Although we have our own notes and comments on scientific issues in front of us, we have been unable to document in a more formal way for the record.
48 I do not supervise staff, but am part of the management team.
49 We need to continue to find ways to depoliticize the agency, so employees and their managers can implement the agency's mission without inappropriate influence from political agendas that do not always respect scientific integrity. Strong policies and education inside and outside the agency could serve as a buffer to such influences.
50 Recent scientific integrity training/all hands suggested that the scientific integrity office was never faced with issues that resulted from the previous administration and were not prepared to act. The SI office is the main avenue to voice concerns about SI and should be trained and prepared to act in a timely manner.
51 N/A
52 (b) (7)(A)
53 I was a supervisor for a number of years; was not a supervisor from 2015 through 2020 and am a supervisor again, which explains some of my answers to previous Qs. I am not sure I previously understood economics to be subject to the SI policy.
54 Need ability to hire more and at higher grade levels. Resources are where scientific integrity has the ability to break down. Knowledge leaves the agency through retirements and we are not able to replace with the same expertise yet expected to uphold the same standards. This will hurt SI over time.
55 In the last two years, there were times that I felt the political leadership was valuing politics over science.
56 The scientific integrity report out for all hands in ord in spring of 2021 was terrific. All the speakers were excellent - particularly (b) (6) the data shared was great and transparent. it was so educational and uplifiting!
57 Clarity regarding implications of broader policy concerns / constraints that impact review and assessment of submissions to the Agency and senior manager direction to supervisors regarding staff follow-up might be helpful.
58 Last administration was particularly challenging. Things seem much better now.
59 Due to current FTE ceilings, there are limited staff to support cross-training and cross-review of written products within a timely period. Staff are not always replaced and rarely replaced in time for a transfer of knowledge. Even though a supervisor may plan for transfer of knowledge, it cannot happen if there is without additional staff.
60 The last two years have been challenging regarding scientific integrity at EPA. It is particularly challenging when an Administration does not integrate sound science into policy priorities.
61 Our current hiring practice does not reflect a culture of scientific integrity.
62 Data is just as important as other content in upholding scientific integrity. It is very powerful and can be used and misused. One way to ensure this is to provide processes & procedures for QA/QC of data post collection. This could happen in the form of good metadata. (b) (6) can assist but there is much on his plate. Perhaps a senior level scientific integriy staffer can collaborate with (b) (6) to put in place what is needed. This should be a generalist with broad program expertise and knowledge of data systems.
63 EPA need scientific integrity.
64 I am priveledged to have 20 high quality and dedicated staff, mostly chemists, who value each other as a team, so I have not had to test the support of my managers in regards to scientific integrity.
65 (b) (7)(A) There needs to be a better way and more support given to those that raise questions.
66 My immediate supervisor is great. They uphold scientific integrity unless overruled by their supervisor. That is more the issue - senior management making decisions (or following suggestions/guidance from above them) which are not fully supported by science.
67 None
68 (b) (5) If scientific integrity is the critical element, then the metrics that seem to be driving everything should reflect that priority and there should be more focus on expertise needed in the decisions as to what divisions are allowed to hire staff.
69 If Scientific Integrity was a problem during the last Administration, why didn't our SI leadership report it and why are we continuing to use the same experts if they were not willing to speak up.
70 The most re-occurring question that comes up is where is the line between scientific integrity and policy choices. Having more discussion, training, support along those lines would be useful.
71 Manager specific training on scientific integrity and expectations would be beneficial.
72 Very little day-to-day direct exposure to relevant science. Arises episodically for particular policy matters.
73 Provide annual information (refresher) on scientific integrity requirements.
74 I suspect that the direction divisional management gives is motivated by political concerns rather than and at the expense of the integrity of the science.
75 It is critical for risk managers to be aware of and defend scientific integrity. It is also critical for risk assessors to know the difference between science policy and pure science. The conclusions of a risk assessment include many assumptions or decisions to come up with conservative conclusions which will cover all possibilities. A discussion of the science and assumptions behind the risk assessment is not an infraction of scientific integrity. It is a respectful scientific discussion about how conclusions apply to different real-world scenarios.
76 Scientific Integrity is closely related to Quality Assurance and Quality Control, an assertation which is probably not in question. However, QA/QC is a time and personnel intense aspect of everything from Research & Development laboratory and field studies to operations and maintenance of building and infrastructure that supports the EPA's mission. Supervisor/managers could be better supported with more dedicated FTEs to QA/QC especially as it pertains to extramural management, (i.e. - Contracts, grants Interagency or Cooperative Agreements). The creation of Quality Management Plans which are operationalized in Quality Assurance Project Plans leads to defensible environmental data collection use for intended purposes such as policy or standards development benefiting human health and/or the environment.
77 the prior years the scientific integrity of our agency was not upheld and actively challenged. (b) (7)(A), (b) (5)
78 Following rules and roles scientific integrity helps having no or minimum observations when OIG performances a Program Audit
79 (b) (6) I has less of a direct role in upholding scientific integrity than managers in other divisions. Employees in (b) (6) do engage with scientific principles in our enforcement, counseling, or litigation work even if our focus is primarily on legal issues. To the extent some survey questions asked about 2 years from 2019-20, I only joined EPA in 2020.
80 We need to do the full training, live web or face to face. This really keeps people involved and understanding what this means and why it is important.
81 Need tangible examples of behaviors to support a culture of scientific integrity in all areas of EPA's work
82 (b) (5)

83 This attribute should be a consideration in the selection of political leaders

84 I'd like to see Scientific Integrity principles be communicated more broadly and more often to all staff and contractors to ensure that all employees, even those that do not directly deal with science, regulatory decisions or scientific policy, understand the importance of Scientific Integrity and how it relates to their individual job, regardless of job series or grade level.

85 Where I didn't feel supported, it was because of influence from political appointees. The areas of concern have been raised and discussed already.

86 Training.

87 (b) (6) should adhere to the advance notification process time limitations of ~ 2 weeks for programmatic/policy review.

88 I was unsure about how to address two scientific integrity concerns over incidents outside my section and division, especially since they were minor. Addressing these concerns (beyond not relying upon the data) would have required management coordination across branches/divisions; some tools for this would be helpful.

89 none

90 Scientific integrity has always been the backbone of EPA. I don't believe that it has ever left (b) (6) and I will always make sure to hold it as the utmost respect.

91 More applicable hands on training on how it applies to specific jobs and tasks as opposed to a general policy statement so clearer on what it means to 'uphold the scientific integrity policy'.

92 the science doesn't change from administration to administration only policy changes as to what is priority

93 Political leadership within (b) (6) and other National Program Offices under the last administration were not advocates of scientific integrity. As a supervisor, I felt all I could do with my staff is document and bear witness to what we were experiencing.